

Serial No. : 10/506,460
Filing Date : February 28, 2005
Page 19

REMARKS

The remarks presented herein are believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action of August 27, 2007. Accordingly, reconsideration is requested.

The Office Action states that Applicant did not provide a listing of all claims readable on the confluence of both elected groups of species.

Accordingly, Applicant herein elects Species A1 from Group A and Species B1 from Group B for prosecution in the present application. Claims 1, 19-21, 35, 36 and 39-49 are each generic. Claims 22, 24-34, 37 and 65 are each readable on both Species A1 and Species B1. Thus, claims 1, 19-22, 24-37, 39-49 and 65 are either generic or are readable on both Species A1 and B1. Claims 2-18 and 50-64 are not readable on Species A1. Claims 7-18, 23, 38 and 53 are not readable on Species B1.

Further, as noted in the previous Response, upon the allowance of a generic claim, Applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 C.F.R. 1.141. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is a generic claim, and that claims 2-65, which are dependent on claim 1, should be considered.


Accordingly, in view of the above election of Species A1 and B1, and the above remarks suggesting that claim 1 is a generic claim, an action on the merits of claims 1-65 is earnestly requested.

Should Examiner Prakasam have any questions or need further information, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

JANNIS MOUTSOKAPAS

By: Van Dyke, Gardner, Linn & Burkhardt, LLP



Date: September 27, 2007.

Deidre D. Link
Registration No. 57 184
2851 Charlevoix Drive, S.E., Suite 207
P.O. Box 888695
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49588-8695
(616) 975-5500